Reply to Office Action of: October 10, 2006 Attorney Docket No.: K35A1449

## **REMARKS**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application. By way of summary, Claims 1-10 were pending in this application. In the present amendment, the Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 5 and canceled Claims 2 and 9-10 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3-8 remain pending for consideration.

## AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from previously pending Claim 2. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that this amended claim is allowable over the prior art of record.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e): CLAIMS 1 AND 3-8

The Office action rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,898,730, issued to Hanan (the Hanan patent). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Hanan patent fails to identically teach every element of the claim. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must <u>identically</u> teach every element of the claim).

In particular, Claim 1, inter alia, now recites "communicating a request for dismounting the disk drive from the external device via the first BCH Interface; dismounting the disk drive from the first communication medium if a valid response is received from the external device via the first BCH interface." The Hanan patent fails to teach these recited steps.

The Examiner has cited Col. 3, lines 53-56 and Col. 4, lines 48-53 of the Hanan patent as anticipating these steps. See Office action, page 4. These passages of the Hanan patent have been set forth below for the Examiner's convenience:

According to exemplary embodiments, the switch 114 includes a multiplexer. The multiplexer is used by switch

Reply to Office Action of: October 10, 2006 Attorney Docket No.: K35A1449

114 to selectively connect to either first bus connection 110 or second bus connection 112.

Hanan, Col. 3, Il. 53-56.

However, if the heartbeat message from disk drive host interface 106 has ceased or otherwise stopped, then a timeout will occur. In response, interface controller 116 can send an interrupt or any other form of "ping" message or command to disk drive host interface 108 over [second] bus connection 112 to determine if second bus connection [112] is active. If interface controller 116 does not receive a response from disk drive host interface 108 within a certain timeout period, [second] bus connection 112 can be considered to be inactive as well. Otherwise, interface controller 116 can control switch 114 to selectively connect to second bus connection 112.

Hanan, Col. 4, II. 42-53.

As is explained in the above passages of the Hanan patent, if a timeout occurs and a disk drive can no longer communicate through one host interface, the disk drive in Hanan pings the host over a second host interface and then connects to the host via the second host interface. Hanan does not, however, disclose the steps set forth in Claim 1 of the present application: "communicating a request for dismounting the disk drive from the external device via the first BCH interface; dismounting the disk drive from the first communication medium if a valid response is received from the external device via the first BCH interface."

As the Examiner indicated on page 4 of the Office action, Hanan does disclose pinging a second connection once the disk drive can no longer communicate via the first connection, but Hanan <u>does not</u> disclose communicating a request for dismounting the disk drive from the external device via the interface through which the external device and external disk drive system are currently communicating.

Moreover, Hanan nowhere discloses a "request for dismounting a disk drive." Instead, Hanan discloses detecting when an interface "has ceased or otherwise stopped." Col. 4, II. 42-43. When an interface has thus failed, it would make no sense to send a request for dismounting a disk drive via that interface.

Page 5 of 7

Reply to Office Action of: October 10, 2006 Attorney Docket No.: K35A1449

Similarly, Hanan does not disclose dismounting a disk drive from the first communication medium if a valid response is received from the external device via the first BCH interface. Again, although Hanan does disclose receiving a response from a second connection once the disk drive can no longer communicate via the first connection, Hanan does not disclose dismounting a disk drive from a first communication medium if a valid response is received via the interface through which the external device and external disk drive system are currently communicating.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over the cited reference, and the Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 1.

Claims 3-8, which depend from Claim 1, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 1, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Reply to Office Action of: October 10, 2006 Attorney Docket No.: K35A1449

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the rejections. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1209.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 2, 2007

oason T. Evans, Esq. Reg. No. 57,862

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

20511 Lake Forest Drive Lake Forest, CA 92630

Tel.: (949) 672-7000 Fax: (949) 672-6604